+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

Friday, August 26, 2005

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Room 540 at 624 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. at 9:30 a.m., Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairperson ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairperson JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Commissioner (via telephone)

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner
ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Commissioner
MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner
KENNETH L. MARCUS, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

JOHN BLAKELEY

TERESA BROOKS

CHRISTOPHER BYRNES

DEBRA CARR, ESQ., Associate Deputy Staff Director
IVY DAVIS, Director ERO/Acting Chief Regional Programs
Coordination Unit

BARBARA DELAVIEZ

TERRI DICKERSON, Assistant Staff Director

PAMELA A. DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative Services and Clearinghouse Division

BARBARA FONTANA

GEORGE M. HARBISON, Director, Human Resources Division
Acting Chief, Budget and Finance Division

SETH JAFFE

SOCK-FOON MACDOUGALL

TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director for Management, Office of Management

EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentarian

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

LISA NEUDER

KIMBERLY SCHULD (via telephone)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

A-G-E-N-D-A

Management and Operations 6
Commissioner special assistant hiring
freeze6
Regional office closures 9
Web site management 23
State Advisory Committee Issues
Action on SAC reports 23
Establishing working group on SACs 24
Future Briefings 55
Update on future hearings55
Number briefings and hearings 58
Hold a briefing on the Voting Rights Act 67
Approve a revised scope for the Patriot
Act and Anti-Arab and Anti-Muslim
Intolerance
Compendium of Roberts' advocacy record
before Supreme Court 74

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

9:36 a.m.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The meeting will come to order.

This meeting is taking place in the Commission's Washington D.C. headquarters. Commissioner Braceras is participating telephonically.

In response to a request from the State members Advisory Committee there special is telephone connection for members of the public to listen into this meeting. This is done at this meeting as an accommodation because the Commissioners may discuss or will discuss some matters in which Advisory Committee members have State expressed particular interest, but it will not be done on a regular basis because of the expense involved.

This is a continuation of the meeting of July 22, 2005 that was recessed without concluding all the items on the agenda. On July 22nd we covered a number of items, including our announcements, the Staff Director's report, passage of our annual enforcement report and approval of our proposed budget for fiscal year 2007.

The meeting will resume with item VI Management and Operations. But before starting on that

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

topic, I just want to mention that Commissioner

Braceras participated in an event, I believe

yesterday, Jennifer, at the National Press Club?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And I believe at least one media source indicated that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights had taken a position with respect to the nomination of --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, really?
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I have no doubt. I just want to go on the record that Commissioners are free to express their views on any and all issues in their personal capacities. And yesterday Commissioner Braceras exercised that right and the comments that she made yesterday, while I agree with them personally they were not made in any official capacity.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, they certainly were not. I apologize. I did, I stated from the outset and again during the question and answer period that I was there in my individual capacity. And the Commission was listed as one of several organizations with which I'm affiliated or which I work for. So it

was only used to identify what my jobs are and who I But I made very clear that the only group I was 2 am. there representing officially was the Independent 3 Womens Group. 5 So, I apologize for that. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, no. There's no apology needed. You didn't do anything wrong. 8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I don't 9 think I did. 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I mention this 11 only to --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Hello. 12 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Hello, Jennifer? COMMISSIONER YAKI: The brunch has begun 14 15 at the Braceras' residents. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I don't know 16 what that is. 17 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, that's not on your end? 19 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, it's somebody else's conference call. 21 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's pause. Let's adjourn until we straighten this mess out. 23 (Whereupon, at 9:39 a.m. off the record 24 25 until 9:46 a.m.)

VI. Management and Operations

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Where were we?
Management and Operations.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, you were saying, which is correct, that no apologies are needed from Commissioner Braceras. The apology that is needed is from CNN and any other media outlet that misreported this.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Abby, if that's the standard, that's going to cause problems because the media gets it wrong on a regular basis, so --

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I understand that.

But I'm just saying we do not hold Commissioner

Braceras responsible here.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. Okay. Back to Management and Operations. Some items in this section were already covered, such as approval of the 2007 budget. We will now deal with those items that have not yet been addressed, specifically financial corrective actions and Web site management.

Over the last several months several of us have made the sacrifice of not hiring special assistants for this fiscal year in order to bring our fiscal house in order. The question has arisen as to

whether we would refrain from hiring new commissioner assistants for 2006. The Staff Director has advised that we have now reached the point in light of recent staff attrition where we would be able to defer closure of our Denver and Kansas City offices until fiscal year 2007 if we continue to refrain from hiring commission special assistants through fiscal year 2006 as long as we receive approximately the level of appropriations recently passed by the House of Representatives.

Could I have a motion to retain the hiring freeze on Commission special assistants through fiscal year 2006.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: So moved.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Discussion?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I mean I have a special assistant, obviously, but I just wanted to make sure that everybody is comfortable with the fact that the Chair, Commissioner Yaki, Commissioner Taylor would not be having special assistants?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Let me speak to one aspect of that. My special assistant is functioning as I am sharing her with Commissioner Taylor. And to the extent to which the Chair needs

her, she is also working for the Chair. So I have spread my -- I've shared the wealth, as it were, in asking her to do this.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I'm not comfortable with it, but this is where we find ourselves. It makes my life a lot more difficult, and I suspect that the same is true for the other Commissioners who don't have a special assistant, but this is the sacrifice that should be made so that we can avoid reductions in staff and office closures for 2006.

Again, the game plan is to get our house in order to put out some good reports, do some good work and demonstrate that this agency is capable of functioning in an effective manner. And at that point we're going to put out our hand and say we need some more money. And I say that as someone who is not all enamored with the notion of big government. If we're going to have the Commission, I think that the Commission needs to receive a sufficient amount of funds to effectively do its mission.

So, at that point, I guess unless there are no other comments, we'll vote.

All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All opposed? 2 It passes unanimously. 3 on to deferral of Next we move the 4 regional office closures. May I have a motion to 5 postpone the regional office closures? COMMISSIONER YAKI: So moved. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second? 8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second. 9 CHAIRMAN **REYNOLDS:** Thank you. Discussion? Commissioner Kirsanow? 10 11 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'd like to ask the staff. I think we had this discussion in, maybe it 12 was the June meeting but I wanted to be clear as to 13 what the ramifications of this deferral are. 14 15 My recollection is that reframing from hiring special assistants gives us a little bit of the 16 17 cushion necessary for this deferral, but it doesn't vanquish the problem and it may be something that 18 needs to be revisited sometime in 2007. Is that 19 20 correct? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: 21 That's correct, Commissioner Kirsanow. Given the recent attrition, we 22 now project that the appropriations amount that the 23 House bill includes would provide us with enough money 24 to continue operations through 2006 as long as we 25

don't have special assistants and we would still be able to bring on a few additional people. We're thinking of general counsel and a couple of people in procurement and a budget and finance officer. project that we would be fine until the end of 2006. However, unless we receive greater amount а appropriations for 2007, we are projecting that we would have a problem again during that year. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And then --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. think there's static over the phone. I'm sorry to interrupt. I'm getting some interface. I don't know if it's that cross talk again or it's somebody whispering in their microphone, but --VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm sorry, Jennifer. I believe that was me and I'm terribly sorry. It did not occur to me that, of course, my mike is on. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, I'm sorry. I couldn't hear what was being said. VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. No, apologize. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Thanks. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: For Commissioner

Kirsanow's benefit, let me just reiterate that we are

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

projecting that as long as the Commissioners refrain from hiring special assistants through the end of 2006, the 2006 House Appropriations figure should be sufficient to allow us to continue operations through 2006 and still be able to bring on a few additional staff members. And we're projecting new hires in the areas of the procurement and budget and finance and to general counsel. However, assuming that the salaries of federal workers continue to rise, we would still run into a problem in 2007.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And the continuation of the operations presumes the incorporation of our ability to continue to discharge our reports?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's right.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. Is there any kind of compromise of those reports by virtue of the attrition that we've experienced?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We've experienced attrition over the last decade, and we certainly do not have the capacity to product the number or complexity of reports today that we were able to do five or ten years ago. I don't know that there's a significant difference in our projected ability to complete reports in 2006 as compared to 2005. But we

certainly will continue to be in a very tight financial situation both with respect to national reports and also with respect to our regional and State Advisory Budget. So we'll be very tight.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'd just like to add I agree with everything the Staff Director said, but I'd like to add that our problem is a structural problem and it does not go away. We face this issue year after year. And basically we're in a vise. Every year salaries go up and our budget remains, more or less, the same. And so every year we're going to have to deal with these fiscal issues.

What we have on the table today is a fix; it's a temporary fix and it will get us through 2006 without having to close offices or to have a reduction in force. But the problem will remain so long as we have flat budget while expenditures increase.

Vice Chair Thernstrom?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, there is going to be a motion down the road here that we shift to more briefings and fewer reports, and we'll discuss that at the time the motion is made. But I assume that that will mean some savings to us; that briefings and posting the briefings and posting Commissioners' responses to those briefings is a savings over having

to put out reports, when really given our staff limitations here we would need to be contracting work and so forth.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The way I would put it is that the shift from a report model to a briefing model if that's what's voted on today, would give us greater budget flexibility. It would give us greater flexibility in the event that we have either increases or decreases.

The greatest part of our expense in terms of putting together a report is staff time. Briefings can be done with either less or more staff time, which is to say they can be very complex briefings that have a lot of staff involved or they could be more streamline. So a shift to briefings, if that's what we're going to do, would give us greater flexibility in that regard.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, when I think about it, it seems to me that salaries are salaries. It's a fixed cost. And whether we do briefings or do a gazillion reports, it really doesn't make a difference if the primary cost is salaries.

For me, the benefit of doing this is that we can get more content out, we can bring in experts who have already done the work. I don't view this as a

means to achieve significant cost savings since
we're not going to RIF. The salaries that we had
today are the salaries that we'll have through 2006.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: May I ask a

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Why have we decided to prioritize keeping other offices open over producing reports? In other words --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I don't view it that way. I don't believe that the shift to more briefings is a --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm going to shift to more briefings, but as I understood the way this was framed is that because of the attrition in staff we really don't have enough people to do as many high quality written reports as we did in the past, and we're not going to be replacing people because we want to keep offices open.

So I guess I'm asking how that choice was made and just what the analysis is and the pros and cons of that. Because it seems to me that without having further information I would come down more on the side of hiring people at headquarters to do reports than keeping offices open. And I know there's

question?

a whole host of political considerations and the members of Congress in those areas are up in arms. But putting aside the politics of it, on the merits I think that it's more valuable for our organization to be putting out reports than just to be having offices.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, Jennifer, again I view those two issues separately. I believe that the briefings, for me doing more briefings will not result in a significant cost savings. And I don't

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I understand that part. It's just that the way the Staff Director keyed up the issue of the attrition and the ability to replace, it seemed to me that that's the way it was keyed up. Did I misunderstand him?

it as a method for increasing our fiscal

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, we will be hiring people during 2006. But, Ken, jump in there.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Commissioner Braceras, I don't think you entirely misunderstood. There is a connection, of course, between the regional offices and reports in a sense that staff in the regional offices are involved in preparing State Advisory Committee reports.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I know. I

stability.

understand that. But that brings us to another problem which we'll discuss later, which is that the Commission headquarters in Washington has very little control over either the content or the quality of those reports. And basically, as I've understood things, we have only voted to accept or reject the reports that they submit to us based on whether or not the proper procedures were used to put out the reports. So in other words, we've had no ability to reject a report based on what we believe to be either poor quality or inappropriate findings of fact or inappropriate recommendations.

And so I guess I'm wondering what the better value for our money is, whether it's to have a decentralized system where we have very little control or a more centralized system where we have more control, not simply over the topic and the content but over the quality. And I know that comes under the heading of SAC reform, but in terms of this discussion and in terms of the budget it seems to me that a decision has been made to allow us to remain open even if that's at the expense of us having resources at headquarters to do our own reports. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, okay. I guess I have a better understanding of where you're going.

1	Speaking just for myself, I think that
2	staff has basically been absorbing the cost associated
3	with the structural deficit. Each year the head count
4	is reduced. Hell, I understand at one point that we
5	had 200 employees. Every year we lose more and more
6	employees. And I think that the Commissioners making
7	a sacrifice by refraining from hiring special
8	assistants, I think that it's time for the
9	Commissioners, in my view, to suffer some of the pain.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I understand
11	that. And, again, maybe I completely misunderstood.
12	But I thought that the Staff Director had raised the
13	issue of attrition amongst, not special assistants but
14	regular Commission staff.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I thought that
17	he had said we were not currently in the process of
18	replacing people in order so that we could be able to
19	keep regional offices open. Am I totally wrong that
20	that's what he said?
21	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would not put it
22	in exactly that way, Commissioner.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Correct me
24	then.
25	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, we've had

attrition over a period of years. And in response to Commissioner Kirsanow's question I addressed not just the attrition over the last few months, but the attrition over a longer period of time. Some of the attrition we've been able to compensate for by backfilling positions. Most of it we have not been. For instance, we recently lost information technology professional and webmaster. We will need to replace him, and we will replace him. But most of the attrition we have not been able to replace --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Because of budget reasons? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Because of budget reasons. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Now, it is true that there is a policy decision to be made to the extent that when we close an office we save both salary money and leasing money. We could have a greater number of analysts in headquarters if we have office --Right. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. That's a good point. And my only question at this juncture wasn't really to open up the merits of that,

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

but was just to ask has that decision been made or is that something -- I just sort of forgot where we are with that? I got the impression from what you said, Ken, that you had made that choice and I just wanted clarification on whether that choice had already been made or whether that's something we're being asked to decide. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would not say that I've made that choice. I would say that the question of whether to keep the offices open has been discussed by the working group on the budget. And I 12 13 thought that there was a consensus there. It has not yet been discussed by the Commissioners. And so that 14 15 decision is up for discussion right now. As for backfilling some of the 16 17 attrition, I suppose that's something that I would have to look at in connection with the decision that's 18 19 made by the Commission during today's meeting. 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. I'm not sure there was a consensus on the working group on that 21 22 issue. Okay. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom? 24 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I just want to,

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

23

just for clarification purposes, restate the
correction I had before which is, Mr. Chairman, you
said salaries are salaries and those are fixed costs.
But if we're short on a staff as a consequence of
attrition, we can't because of budgetary constraints
fill positions that are now empty; my question was
simply are there not additional savings from holding
briefings over putting out the kind of full scale
reports that we had in the past? Because those full
scale reports certainly would require either
additional staff or contracting work out.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I think that
we're dancing around a nuance.
VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The way I view it is
that the shift to briefings increase productivity.
VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But it doesn't
increase our budget. It doesn't bring us more money.
It doesn't reduce the money we have.
COMMISSIONER YAKI: It's more bang for the
buck?
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: It's more bang for
the existing. Okay. Anyway, it was just a

1	clarification because of what you said before.
2	Let's move on.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. And, Jennifer,
4	whether we have a consensus I believe that this vote
5	will decide that issue.
6	Any additional comments?
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, I
8	think it is worth on the record having some
9	clarification of the time table. Because I don't know
10	that the motion was specifically clear.
11	I believe that the motion was to defer
12	closure of these two offices until fiscal year 2007.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 2007. Yes.
14	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Is that the intent
15	of the motion?
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
17	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Okay. Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Unless there
19	are other comments or questions, we'll vote now.
20	All in favor?
21	ALL: Aye.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'd like to
24	abstain.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Please let the
1	

1	record reflect that Commissioner Braceras has
2	abstained.
3	Next up?
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Again, just to
5	clarify for the reasons that I'm not sure about the
6	resources as opposed to hiring more staff people in
7	Washington.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Next up is the
9	deferral
10	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Go ahead.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right. May
12	I have a motion to postpone the regional office
13	closures?
14	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: So moved.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I have a second.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, didn't we
17	just do that? What did we just vote on?
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No. That was for
19	oh, I'm sorry.
20	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: We did. We did.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. I need to
22	flip the page. Thanks.
23	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm not thinking
24	either.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thanks, Jennifer.

1	Okay. Next up is Web site management.
2	May I have a motion to post the July 5th letter by
3	Commissioners Thernstrom, Braceras, Kirsanow, Taylor
4	and me to the Secretary of Education on the Commission
5	Web site.
6	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: So moved.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? Okay.
10	All in favor?
11	ALL: Aye.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
13	The motion passes unanimously.
14	Next up may I have a motion that the
15	letter from Commissioner Yaki to the Secretary of
16	Education be posted to the Commission Web site?
17	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: So moved.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
21	favor?
22	ALL: Aye.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All opposed?
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes
25	unanimously.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

VII. State Advisory Committee Issues

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. At this point I would like to announce that the New Mexico State Advisory Committee report entitled "The Farmington Report: Civil Rights for Native Americans 30 Years Later" and the Arizona State Advisory Committee entitled "Civil Rights Along the U.S. Mexican Border: A Need for Immigration Reform" that were sent to the Commissioners for review will be considered at the September Commission meeting. This is in accordance with the policy of administrative instruction 5.7 and section 13.02 that Commissioners will receive SAC reports two months before taking action on them.

What's next?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Working group.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. May I have a motion to establish a working group on State Advisory Committees? Pretty please?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is that a parliamentary motion?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's in the appendix of Robert's Rules.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I so move. But I do think that the entire motion needs to

be read.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I move that the Commission establish a working group on State Advisory Committees. mission of the working group on State Advisory Committees will be to make specific recommendations to full for the Commission implementing the Advisory Committee administrative and policy reforms which may include: Rechartering of the State Advisory Committees; State Advisory Committee member selection; Commissioner involvement in State Advisory Committee activities; cost effective ways to conduct State Advisory Committee management and operations.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Question, Mr. Chairman. How does this relate to the subsequent motion on membership criteria if it talks about membership selection in this motion?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, assuming that the second motion passes, the Working Group Committee will get together and work through all of the issues associated with the topic.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: If I may further

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

clarify, the motion to be discussed later deals with State Advisory Committee member selection criteria. There may be other issues relating to membership selection procedures, so on and so forth, that are not otherwise subject to a vote today.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chairman, I think that we're doing a little parsing here. And I would say that if we're going to be doing a working group on State Advisory Committees, we should include in that rather than preclude any options, we should include in that the discussion of criteria and term limitations. I think that if I would read this correctly, and I'm not, that the working group on Committees might actually Advisory meet with individuals from State Advisory Committees to seek their input and their feedback on any changes or criteria that we will be looking at. And I think that it would be very incongruous for us given our charter and our history to just engage in top down decrees with regard to the State Advisory Committees, which are a part of our congressional charter, have been part of the historic mission of the Commission for And I would want to amend that the motion many years. include consideration of the membership criteria and the term limitations and defer those two items as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

27 actual votes until this working group reports back. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom? 2 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, are there 3 4 any time constraints here that make that postponement 5 problematic? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I just want to 6 get some time to have some time to absorb this. 8 I guess my first comment is that reading 9 the motion that Vice Chair Thernstrom read, I didn't 10 see that as limiting the working group's ability to 11 interact with members of SACs, to get input from SACS and other folks. 12 13 Now, the other questions, I think that that causes a problem because we have a backlog. 14 15 you know, when the Commission was reconstituted we had a backlog and it's just grown since then. I think 16 that we should vote to amend the selection criteria as 17 18 soon as possible so that we can start working on the backloq. 19

We've had a teleconference with SAC chairs. We've gotten their input. And, you know, it's not clear to me that there's going to be new arguments and new evidence provided the working group that would alter any minds.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: May I respond?

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I understand what you said, but what you said to me precisely goes to the point that I'm making.

First of all, I mean an old politician so you got to forgive me for this. But it seems to me that with regard to the backlog, that by changing the criteria I don't see we're doing anything more than just simply adding to the backlog. All the committees that have submitted their membership and are in line right now at the Commission are going to have to go back and redo that. All the other people who along the way for there, are going to have to go back and do that.

quite frankly, given Ι think the importance that this Commission is placing upon this reform effort, I don't see why we couldn't make some sort of provision -- I wouldn't call it a deal -- but a provision that would provide for one year renewals of these charters just to get them out of the way through the process looking while we qo of revisions, if they are warranted, to the State Advisory Committees. Because I just think that one of the things you're going to find is that the imposition of term limit issue is very vaque because if there are

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

people on there who are serving ten years and have been just nominated for a new term, many of those people are in the leadership of the state chairs. And if we adopt that, they go or maybe they don't go. I don't know. I don't know if it means if they have been nominated, they get to complete it or not. But if they do go, then you have lost institutional memory in terms of being able to move the machinery to get those charters back up in a timely manner.

And I just think, I understand that the majority on this Commission wants to look at reforming, relooking at -- Commissioner Braceras has made it very clear that she has very strong views on this -- the SACs. But I think that to do that and at the same time -- I think that there's a transparency issue here and an openness issue here that I think would be undermined if in one motion we say we're doing a working group of State Advisory Committees to look at all these different questions and on the other hand we're saying oh, and by the way, for all you State Advisory Committees this is a new membership criteria that we decided we're going to do.

And with all due respect, there was a phone call about this. But this phone call was in response to the fact that the State Advisory chairs

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

had absolutely not notice that this thing was coming up on the agenda. And it was through a lot of sabre rattling by them, by myself, by the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the Asian-Pacific American Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus, the Disability Caucus and the Women's Caucus on Capitol Hill who sent us a letter asking us to defer any of these decisions for further study. And I think that the further study is embodied in the first motion. So why preempt what could be a more complete package of reforms approving the second two, which I think will simply engender hostility and suspension between any participating SAC members and the working group on reform? I don't think it'll get anything done. I think that the SAC chairs who have any contact with me and have been working Capitol Hill are going to, for lack of a better word, go nuts over the idea that there's a working group that we've established, but at the same time we've also said to them by the way, we want you to work with us but we're throwing back the entire membership in your face right now and we're doing term limits, and we don't know how that's going to impact you. But, sorry, that's the way we're going to do.

I just think that there's a better way of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

doing it. And I think a combined motion that looks at all these things maybe with provisional approval of one year charters for these other organizations pending the resolution of the working group would be a more effective compromise that creates transparency, that creates openness and provides integrity to this process. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This is

Commissioner Braceras.

So, Michael, if I hear you correctly, your proposal is to establish the working group but to retire everybody now and let the working group sort out the other issues?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I would say I mean we meet once a month. We have a lot of things on the calendar. We already found last month that a briefing and large combining amounts of work resulted in having a continuation meeting and including one over the phone, which no one was happy about.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: It just seems to me that it isn't that -- it actually would probably work out better for us in terms of -- at least my opinion. I'm not speaking on behalf of the entire Commission.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But given the workload that we're going on and the fact that we may have briefings in September and October, January and February which will entail work. As the Staff Director said, they don't necessarily result in cost savings, but as the Chair said we get a lot more bang for our buck. We're visible. We're out there. We're doing things. We're showing things that are going on.

I think that the SAC thing, the SAC issue is where there are lot of different constituencies involved, as can be evidenced by the number of letters that we received just the regional office issue which was generated in large part by the SACs. And that if we were to see if we could provide one year provisional rechartering of all those veteran line to get those out of the way, could engage in a much more fully integrated and deliberate process of looking at SAC reforms that, quite frankly, may end up with the same result that you folks want but from my point of view has more integrity in the process such that I won't be writing a 500 page dissent.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm not opposed to what you're saying, but what I would like to do is hear from the Staff Director, I would like to hear

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

from Ken on what he thinks and the pros and cons of doing it both ways.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, before Ken goes, I'd like to jump in.

Ιt me that the selection seems to criteria, that there are not many unknowns left on that particular issue. The issue has been discussed amongst the Commissioners. We have had a slue of letters from members of SACs and from members of So there, I don't anticipate with this process that we set forth additional information to be provided on the selection criteria issue. And that's why I believe that that issue should be voted on today.

Will it entail a delay? The answer is yes, but I think it's worth it. I don't believe that the additional inconvenience that's generated because of a change in our selection criteria, I don't think it outweighs the importance of the issues.

And so that we are clear, the issues and what we want to do is to increase and expand the diversity of ideas that we get from our SAC membership. And we believe that this change will result in an increased diversity in ideas. And also it's also a reaction to a notion of proportional

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

representation that's in our current rules.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So Vice Chair Thernstrom?

CHAIR THERNSTROM: I VICE am rather sympathetic to the process argument that Commissioner Yaki is making. And I wonder if the one year, if we need a year here for the rechartering and how long we can envision working group; when might it come in with its findings and how expeditiously could we act upon its recommendations so that can satisfy we concerns of the Chair and the concerns of Commissioner Yaki both.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I want to hear the answer before I say anything.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I guess my response is it really depends on how it's structured. If we're going to go down this road, it seems to me that I would the selection issue to be dealt with first so that we can get whatever additional input we'll get and so that we can vote on it as soon as possible. Now how much time that requires, I don't know.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: My concern would be to get State Advisory Committees moving as quickly as possible and doing their work as soon as we can. So from the point of view of making sure that the

State Advisory Committees are effective instruments, my hope would be that we very quickly can either charter or recharter them. There's already been, of course, a significant amount of time.

I would imagine that the answer to how quickly could this be done is that the soonest that we could get a recommendation from the working group would be in time for the September meeting, depending on the amount of either deliberation that the working group wanted to do or gathering of input. So there is some question. If the working group were going to do a lot of discussions with other groups, factfinding, it would take a significant amount of time. But the shortest possible would be in time for the September meeting.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well if it's in time in fact for the September meeting. then we have lost nothing by going along with Commissioner Yaki's recommendations, it seems to me. But --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I think I'm sympathetic toward what Commissioner Yaki raised conjoined with a need for being as expeditious as possible.

And I think what I would like to see is if

the working group on reform is going to convene and address certain issues relates to SACs, then the matter of membership be the first thing placed on the agenda, that be considered and reported back to the Commission September. not as soon as We're reinventing or building the space shuttle here. think we've had some preliminary discussions on this. And I think Commissioner Yaki's right that for a variety of different reasons, some of which are political, some of which are substantive in terms of how we go forward with this Commission, it makes sense to bring in some input from the SACs also. Also from the standpoint of transparency. But if we defer this for at last month, and I don't see there being a great downside.

Commissioner Yaki's probably correct that it's not going to change anything. But I think process and the ability to participate on the part of SACs, at least a need to have input, is important.

Does this make any sense?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm just confused.

Because it sounded like what Commissioner Yaki was proposing was more than a one month delay, am I correct? Or would a one month delay satisfy your concern?

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: If we're saying that by adopting at least portions of Commissioner Yaki's recommendations that it will result in a one month delay, that's one thing. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I quess I want clarification from both Commissioner Yaki and some then again, I'd like some more input from the Staff Director. Because the Staff Director and the people of the staff are the ones that work with the SACs on a regular basis. So I want input from the Staff Director on this. Ι thought that Commissioner Yaki was proposing a one year return rate of the vote that we already have while the working group discusses all of these things. So that it would be basically a year long time period in which we would just go forward with, I guess, the current place? That's how I understood his proposal. Maybe I'm wrong. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Braceras, I don't think that it's clear yet. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Well, I'm asking. I'm asking Commissioner Yaki to clarify and

I'm asking the Staff Director to tell us his view.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, but in any case, Jennifer, whatever your initial proposal of

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Commissioner Yaki, it seems to me --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I understand that.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: -- we're not locked into the one year.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I understand that.

I'm trying to understand if a shorter time period satisfies his concerns or not.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Braceras, this is Commissioner Yaki.

I put out the one year simply because it sounded good, for lack of a better word. But seriously the issue is I believe that taking on the rechartering, taking on a whole new look at the State Advisory Committees, especially in the manner that you have suggested and others have suggested or hinted at as well, is something that I don't believe can or should be done in a hurry. Just as it took the working group on rules several months minimum to come up just with changing the rules of how this Commission behaves and puts out reports, here we're dealing with a congressionally mandated part of the duties and powers of the Civil Rights Commission.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. I understand the concern.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: So all I was saying is by one year I was trying not to give too long a time line, but at the same time I didn't also want to artificial deadlines given that this serious, this is important. And we're dealing with a situation involving SACs in states where they may or significant political not have contacts support, this process is going to have to be done I think deliberately, delicately and in a way that best shows the process that you helped put -- reforms that you helped put together, Commissioner Braceras, is followed in other areas as well.

And so when someone says well we can rush through the selection criteria in one month, I think okay, I think we have a briefing in September. We've already had problems with combining briefings and meetings already --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So you don't think that --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm just saying practically -- I was trying to be practical in giving it an outside time limit. And if the working group came back sooner, I think people would just have to judge whether they thought and how fast they came back whether they did an adequate job or not. I just

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

wanted to put an outside time line as a compromise just to get this thing rolling. And that's where I 2 3 am. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can I hear from 5 the Staff Director? VICE Commissioner CHAIR THERNSTROM: Taylor has something he wanted to ask. 8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, I'm sorry. I 9 can't see that. 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner 11 Taylor? 12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: If you could, I 13 would be very impressed. 14 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Get those little Apple 15 video things and just turn it around. COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Right. 16 17 I, too, am very sympathetic to the process concerns. I do, however, see a significant difference 18 19 between the large body making a decision relative to 20 the selection criteria and the issues that 21 proposed to be worked on by the working group, which I 22 view as more mechanical in how the working groups relate to the Commission. These are all important 23 issues, but I think they are very different. Because 24 25 I know that I'm not the only Commissioner that has been concerned about the overall approach in ensuring that, as our Chair has stated, we get a diversity of views from the SACs. And I view that as the issue we would be addressing if we were to vote on these other motions, which again I view as different from how the SACs interact with the Commission which appears to be really the point of the working group.

Having said that, I would not be opposed to some compromise. I think a year is too long. I would not be opposed to an outside date of five or six months with the expectation that our working group is going to come back. And I would expect it to come back in a few months, possibly four months. So I would not be opposed to that if that were a workable compromise and we were all committed to making sure that the working group came back with recommendations that we indeed voted on in that time period to include criteria, term limits and all the other mechanical issues addressed in our motion here.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'd like to come up with a compromise as well. And, again, I think the Staff Director's got a bunch of questions on his plate to answer. I'm not sure why this has to be a total package, why we can't break this into separate pieces

and the working group move much more quickly on the issues that we are postponing today, which is the issue of the membership. Because for many of us the lack of diversity on the SACs is very important.

So one of the questions is can we break the work of the working group into separate parts and have them come back more quickly on the question of the membership?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, it seems to me that the flash point has been the proposal to change the membership criteria. And we've had lots of input on that particular issue. I don't think that there's anyone who objects to the notion of increasing the diversity of views and skills. I believe it was the balancing in terms of race, ethnicity and whatever effect. That is the flash point in my view.

And so, Commissioner Yaki, do you believe that further discussions on that issue is likely to yield useful information?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I do. I do for a couple of reasons.

One, I believe at the conference call with the SACs, was I the only Commission present along with you? You know, just with the SAC chairs. Was anyone else --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that another Commission may have been on.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I was on there.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think it's important that the other Commissioners hear what's been said.

Number two is that because it was done in the context of a very rush basis, from what I've been told there are SAC chairs who would have a more analytical or quantitative presentation that they would want to make to the Commission that should help illuminate and maybe address some of the concerns involved in selection criteria.

So I think that there is merit to it. If it's the Commission's will to push it to September, you know I would take that over doing it today. I just think that there's an overall package here to what we're trying to do. And as much as I respect Commissioner Taylor, I think that the issues involved in the working group are not nearly mechanical. Not especially if I read what Commissioner Braceras has been talking about in terms of content control or content format; that is not a mechanical issue.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, but nobody's talking about doing that today.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. No one is talking

about doing it today. But I was just addressing

Commissioner Taylor's remarks that the working group

on SAC reform, I presume, that would take up that

issue that you would raise, correct?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I suppose it would.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: So therefore it's a content which are more than mechanical.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But that wouldn't preclude it from discussing the --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, how about this? I detect a consensus that we need to work out some type of compromise to address the concerns expressed by Commissioner Yaki. What do you think of having a vote on the membership criteria in, say, October? And if need be, if we believe that it was necessary to have two meetings during October; one for regular business and if you wanted to, and this is addressed to you, Commissioner Yaki, especially but we could have a separate meeting. We can come in and have a Thursday and a Friday. meeting on а apparently this is a very important issue. that time the SAC members who are putting together different analyses would have an opportunity to provide it to us, and we can discuss it.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Can we hear from the Staff Director on this whole thing?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Certainly. I don't know that I have a whole lot to add beyond the points that have already been mentioned.

I suppose there are two points on timing worth keeping in mind. One is that the motion to change selection criteria, if it's made whenever it would be made, would presumably be a motion that would entail sending proposed criteria to the Federal Register for notice and comment, which would commence a period of public comment and discussion, after which the Commission would have the ability to review the public comment and make a final decision. So the vote, whether it's made now, September or October, would not necessarily be the end of the discussion but rather the beginning of a public phase of comment.

And the second point that I would make is, and I don't know to what extent the Commissioners will be concerned to keep this in mind or not, but we do currently have the benefit of an ongoing government accountability audit that focused in significant part on the SAC process. If the SACs were rechartered sooner rather than later while the audit is ongoing,

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that we might have the benefit of comments from the auditors on the new process, which would be in place, as opposed to the alternative which is that we're still in the process of changing things at the time that the audit is completed. So that timing issue might also play in Commissioners' considerations.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I have a question.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So, Ken, what is your preference besides when we vote on the selection criteria portion?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, what I would say is that sooner rather than later is more helpful in terms of getting the State Advisory Committees going and having them do their work and getting whatever benefit we can from the ongoing audit.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: So, look, I had not thought about the fact that, of course, we are facing a public phase here and I'm about to perhaps shift my position here. Why is it not possible to vote on the selection criteria today, the membership criteria, go into the public phase, have the working group functioning simultaneously during that public

phase and as part of the package of response that occurs at the end of that public phase, have the working group's findings be part of the response? So that we don't in fact lose anything by voting today a proposed motion to amend the Commission's regulation regarding membership criteria because we've now got this public phase in which the working group can function as well?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that that's a good idea. The working group have access to the public comments.

Commissioner Yaki?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Based upon having responded to 3,000 public comment requests in the Federal Register by agencies of every ilk and strife, I can tell you that --

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: What a waste of your time.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- there is a far, far different view of a regulation promulgated in the Federal Register in terms of process, especially regarding the SACs and their relationship to this Commission, than it would be if the SACs were involved at least in the front end in the rule that went out into the Federal Register. It is a gigantic

distinction of process. It is a gigantic distinction in terms of how we say to the SACs that we value their input versus simply putting it in the Register and saying join the cast of thousands, write us comments, we'll ignore them like every other federal agency does and then approve them in 45 days.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But didn't we already seek their input? And so what additional input would we be getting?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: But, Commissioner Braceras, what I had said in response to that point is that we did not seek their input in the development of this criteria. The criteria came down and only after they read it and it was headed for the -- I can't remember, June or July -- the July meeting was a conference call put together in a very hurried fashion to try and deal with it. And what I had said earlier is that several SAC chairs have said to me that they did not feel that that gave them adequate time to adequately present more compelling qualitative and quantitative data that might help us, might shift, may But at least allow them the time to make their case in a more coherent manner than it would be -- I mean, we'd essentially be repeating the same process by proving it to the Federal Register, which is okay,

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

we approve it top down. Sorry about that. You got one phone call with us. Goes to the Federal Register.

You got 45 days to comment back on it. And the chances of us making any change at that and then back and reposting it all over again, which would be even more time consuming, I think is nil.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, I'm certainly willing to listen to whatever data and argument they can muster. However, my initial support for the motion, for the proposed motion is my reading of the law and not having a quota system in place. So they might want to consider addressing their comments to that because that is one of the reasons I think it is necessary a rule change in addition to the fact that I think it's just good practice to have a wider array of ideological viewpoints on the SACs.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Just to respond. The quota system, as you referred to, was an administration instruction not in the *Federal Register* regulation that we have been following for years.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I wouldn't restrict Commissioner Braceras' argument to the existence of a quota. Just the use of a racial classification. That for me is the issue.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I agree with

the Chair. And whatever you want to say is that -
COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, we can have a
good fight about that in a few minutes.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Where are we in the process? Because I'd like to make a substitute motion, if I can. I think we're in the discussion phase.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So I'd like to make a substitute motion. Okay. I think I can do that under Robert's Rules.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, you can. Yes.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I thought I could.

Let me propose that we combine the motions related to modifying our selection criteria and term limits, and add that to the agenda of the working committee with a specific charge, however, that the working committee back with specific recommendations on those two points that we will vote on in our October meeting. That will allow us to then trigger the public comment period. Having been a part of the conference call with some of the SAC chairs, I sensed their frustration with the shift which, while I disagreed with, I could sense their frustration

1	nevertheless. And I want to give them an
2	opportunity to present some more cogent arguments than
3	they were able to present just given the short time
4	frame. So I think that's a fair request.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'll second that.
6	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: And that would be my
7	recommendation with the specific charge that we vote
8	on this in October.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'll second it.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other comments?
11	All in favor?
12	ALL: Aye.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
14	Okay. The substitute motion passes unanimously.
15	Okay. So we have made
16	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Don't we need to
17	establish the members? Has that been established?
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, a good point.
19	I assume that, Commissioner Yaki, you
20	would want to be involved?
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm the only in
22	this entire thing?
23	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: You're going to be
24	on every working group we have, unless you can find
25	some

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm hitting that hour limit real fast. 2 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Oh, we all are. 3 In fact, I think that CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 5 we need to check to make sure that we're not bumping up or maybe --COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: We're getting very 8 close to the end of fiscal year. 9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, my hours weren't 10 prorated for the entire year. Were they or were they; 11 I don't know. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is it done by hours or 12 13 days? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: It's for the full 14 15 It's hours for the full year, and staff is putting together a report on the number of hours that 16 17 Commissioners have reported to us that they have spent and the number of hours left. So we can distribute 18 that when it's prepared. 19 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Great. Because every I do a time sheet I get a little nervous. 21 Because I have no idea how close I am. 22 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes. Well, I'm in 23 the same position. 24 25 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Well, there should

1	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I apologize.
2	Never mind.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
4	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I don't understand
5	that, but that's
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Will someone help me
7	with my train of thought here; where were we? Okay.
8	Commissioner Yaki, I'd like to be
9	involved. Volunteers? Okay
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I guess I'm
11	going to recommend, I guess, I mean Staff Director a
12	member of the committee?
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, the Staff
14	Director participates in all subcommittees.
15	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'll do it.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So that's Commissioner
17	Yaki, Reynolds and Taylor. One more?
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'll do it.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Very good.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Unless somebody
21	wants to.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I see Pete is
23	chomping at the bit at this.
24	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: So am I.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right.

1	Where are we? Okay. We can skip that motion.
2	Okay. Am I correct in that we're up to future
3	briefings?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What happened to the
5	motions at the beginning of the packet that we have?
6	Are we going to deal with those?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What topics?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Number of briefings
9	and hearings and the
10	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, that's what
11	we're up to.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
13	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: It got re-ordered,
14	I think.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, that's coming.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. Thank you.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. I need
18	to be off the phone in about 20 minutes.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I just wanted to
21	let you know.
22	VIII. Future Briefings
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I hope that we
24	can get through this in 20 minutes, but we'll see.
25	Okay. Mr. Staff Director, do you have an
- 1	

update on future briefings?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Certainly, Mr. Chairman. I'd be pleased to provide an update as to the status of briefings previously approved by the Commissioners.

I think many have indicated to me that they agree that the briefing on the Stagnation of the Black Middle Class was a success. Staff is preparing a report on the briefing, which we hope to have ready by the next Commission meeting in September. The briefing report will consist of an executive summary, the written statement of the panelists and written comments from the Chairman and Commissioner Yaki.

The next briefing scheduled for the Commission is a briefing on the Patriot Act as it relates to alleged acts of anti-Muslim and anti-Arab discrimination.

At a recent Commission meeting staff were asked to make some changes to the concept paper regarding this briefing. That concept paper as amended has been distributed and there will be a motion concerning it shortly.

Assuming that it is approved, the briefing will go as described in that concept paper. It's scheduled for September 16, 2005.

So far Mr. Parvez Ahmed of the National Council for American-Islamic Relations and Andrew McCarthy, Senior Fellow at the Foundation for Defense Democracies and former Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York have agreed to speak at the briefings. extended invitations have Federal Bureau of Investigation and to current and former officials of other components of the Department of Justice, but have not yet received definitive responses from these invitees yet. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Staff Director, I want to add that the President of the Arab American Anti-Discrimination Committee, Congresswoman Mary Rose Oakar is interested in appearing at the briefing as well. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Thank you. That is news to me. Delighted to hear of her interest. She, of course --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We've had her in the past. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: She addressed, I think, the Patriot Act at our last briefing. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We have also begun planning on the November briefing on campus anti-Semitism based on the speaker list set forth in concept paper previously approved by Commission. Ι will be able to provide more information on this in September.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any questions?

Additional questions or comments?

All right. The next issue deals with the number of briefings and hearings conducted by the Commission. The motion reads "The Commission will adopt a new policy of issuing only one major national report each year and of shifting the available resources to conduct the greatest feasible number of briefings and hearings.

The Commission has customarily drafted approximately three to four major national reports on civil rights issues each year, in addition to the State Advisory Committee reports, briefing reports, and other statements and analyses. These major national reports are often lengthy, time-consuming, and resource-intensive. Since the topics of the reports are often approved two years in advance, the major national reports are not always timely.

The Commission's national briefings and

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

hearing, on the other hand, which may be accompanied by short printed briefing reports, have offered more timeliness and flexibility and do not impose as severe strain on Commission resources. They can address a broader range of civil rights issues and bring a higher profile to them. They are cost effective, requiring much less in terms of staff preparation. They are easy to arrange in a short time frame so that they may cover more timely civil rights Timeliness is especially important so that the President, Congress and the public can act on any recommendations that the Commission may make as a result of a briefing or hearing."

May I have a motion to increase the number of briefings and hearings conducted by the Commission.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: So moved.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I have a second?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Staff For the Director. This would require would us, this essentially supersede the process we went through in, it June when we were picking the enforcement report and the other report, the one that Commissioner Thernstrom was chairing at the end, so ably.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Commissioner. I think it would be neater to have an 2 additional separate motion on the topic. But as I 3 understand this, it would require that we have only 5 one national report per year, which is the statutorily mandated enforcement report. 6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. 8 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: And any other 9 reports be converted into briefs or hearings. 10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And do we need to 11 go through that process again and decide which of those to make? 12 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure, that and timing Yes, I believe that we have to address this. 14 issues. 15 We have to go back and take a look at the list and see how we're going to reorganize --16 17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, we'd stick 18 with the same list, we'd just --19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: -- choose from 20 that list which will be the statutory report? 21 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's my hope, unless someone moves to add something or delete something. 23 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I believe that the 24 Commission made it easier a couple of months ago. As 25

I recall, there was already a designation of the statutory enforcement reports in 2007. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, okay. And the 5 other topics will still be covered in the form of We won't be dropping any topics, in other briefings. 6 words? 8 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's right. And 9 just for clarification, the Voting Rights Act 10 designated as the enforcement report for 2006. And I 11 believe that elementary and secondary degradation was selected as the statutory enforcement report for 12 13 fiscal year 2007. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thank you. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions or comments? 16 17 COMMISSIONER YAKI: One question. The 18 briefing in October won't supplant the enforcement 19 report? 20 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. 21 22 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: That's correct. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor 23 24 say aye. ALL: Aye. 25

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition. The motion passes unanimously.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Just one question. I apologize for asking this, but I just don't remember the discussion as to the Patriot Act, how it appeared on the radar. Did the Commission have a particular interest?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Me.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Oh, okay. Okay.

All right. I just wanted to make sure I -- I just didn't have a --

Out this privileged position that Mr. Yaki has in that one of the nice things about how we work -- well, the reconstituted Commission, I think, is just doing an excellent job. I think that you make very good points and I think that despite the fact that we do have so me fundamental differences, I think that we've done a good job of trying to work through our differences. And I've said this in the past, and I'll probably say it again. It just amazes me at the commonity that we have now. And, you know, I think that we do a very good job of --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: We had comedy before, too; spelled differently. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I guess we need 3 to define our terms. 5 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I thought that was spelled C-O-M-E-D-Y. 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 8 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, let me add 9 something to that. I think you're perfectly aware 10 all Commissioners with the exception 11 Commissioner Yaki would have postponed the briefing on the Patriot Act until we --12 13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: 2010. VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No. No. But until 14 15 we at least had some new information. I mean, there have been a series of hearings now on the Patriot Act. 16 We're adding another. I would have had preference for 17 waiting until we see how the reauthorization of the 18 19 act, the reauthorization amendment of the act plays 20 out and so forth. But you felt very strongly about having it now. 21 22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I appreciate that. VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: And we have all 23 felt that it is important to respond 24 to your

25

preference here.

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Next. The next
3	motion is
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Adjourn?
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
6	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, no. Don't
7	listen to him.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The next motion
9	involved converting previous approved reports into
10	briefings.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: WE did that.
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: We just did that,
13	Jerry.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, gees.
15	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: The next motion is
16	to hold the briefing on the Voting Rights Act.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, no. We didn't do
19	that one.
20	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, we didn't do that.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, we sort of did,
23	but we didn't go into the specifics.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion

reads: "I move that the following topics which the Commission decided to address in a future national reports during the Commission's May 13, 2005 meeting be instead addressed in briefings to be held in 2006 and 2007. And the topics are: Representation of Minorities in the Census; Assessment of Effectiveness of Historically Black Colleges; School Choice, the Blaine Amendment, and; Anti-Catholicism. And that's one topic. Minority Children in State Foster Care & Adoption.

And upon this motion the topics of reauthorization of the temporary provision of the Voting Rights Act and elementary and secondary school desegregation would still be addressed in national reports in 2006 and 2007 respectively."

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So moved.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: One question, and I think this was already addressed in previous discussion but I just wanted to be clear on this. If we're converting some of this to briefing, does that have any impact on the budget submission that we made earlier?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Off the top of my head, I would say no, but I naturally defer to the Staff Director.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We're going to have to review that and see if further clarification needs to be made to our Appropriations Committees. It may well be since we indicated that we would be doing reports, that we would need to clarify that. But we'll have to review the specific language that was made in our communications to Congress and take whatever are required.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: One other question here. It's a little unclear under this motion, "the topics of reauthorization the temporary provision of the Voting Rights Act and elementary and secondary school desegregation would be addressed in national reports." But they are also the subject of briefing; that is not clear from the language of the motion.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: It really should read, the amendment here, will be --

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I'm sorry, Vice Chair Thernstrom. I'm not sure I entirely heard. I think that you indicated that under the vote that had just been taken, we would be doing Voting Rights Act

1	as a national report, although we may also have a
2	briefing on it as well. Elementary and secondary
3	desegregation would be the subject of a report
4	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Of course. Of
5	course. I'm sorry.
6	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: But we had not yet
7	determined whether we will
8	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Have a briefing.
9	All right. It just needs to be clear. It's not clear.
10	Topics of reauthorization would still be addressed in
11	national reports, that is that topic is in addition a
12	briefing?
13	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's right.
14	Elementary and secondary may or may not require an
15	additional hearing or briefing.
16	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Right.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Where are we?
18	Have we voted?
19	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Additional
22	questions, comments? All in favor say aye.
23	ALL: Aye.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
25	The motion passes unanimously.
- 1	i

1	Next up motion to hold a briefing on the
2	Voting Rights Act. 2005 marks the 40th anniversary of
3	the enactment of the Voting Rights Act. Debate has
4	already begun on reauthorization of the temporary
5	provisions of the Act due to expire in 2007.
6	Therefore, I move that the Commission hold a briefing
7	on the Voting Rights Act in October. That is the
8	motion.
9	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: October 2005?
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Will someone
11	second this motion?
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes, I second it.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Discussion?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. I would just
15	request that we ensure that an invitation to appear is
16	extended to the National Voting Rights Act Commission,
17	a nonprofit group that's been going around the country
18	holding hearings on this.
19	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Sure. Sure.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any additional
21	comments? Okay.
22	All in favor?
23	ALL: Aye.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition. The
25	motion passes unanimously.

Okay. Next up is a motion to approve a
revised scope for the Patriot Act and Anti-Arab and
Anti-Muslim Intolerance. Okay. Here is the motion.
"I move that the scope of the Patriot Act and the
Anti-Arab and Anti-Muslim Intolerance briefing examine
alleged incidents of anti-Arab and anti-Muslim
backlash following 9/11. Prior Commission action
addressed whether efforts to combat terrorism and
secure our homeland affect immigration policies,
increase our concerns about racial/ethnic profiling or
raise issues of selective enforcement of laws
infringing on civil rights and civil liberties,
detention policies, access to counsel, and the use of
military and executive authority. This briefing would
address sections 215 and 505 of the Patriot Act, as
well as specific practices of the FBI under the
Patriot Act and/or other actions under color of law in
detaining and/or questioning Arab-Americans and
American Muslims. Section 215 provides that FBI
personnel may apply for a court order requiring the
production of business records relevant to an
investigation concerning international terrorism or
clandestine intelligence activities, provided that
investigation of a U.S. citizen or a legal permanent
resident may not be conducted solely on the basis of

First Amendment protected activities. Section 505 authorizes the use of an administrative subpoena of personal records relevant to an investigation concerning international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities, without requiring probable cause.

The Commission will seek information to address the following issues:

Testimony identifying discrimination, scapegoating, and profiling of Arab and Muslim Americans in enforcement of sections 215 and 505 off the Patriot Act;

Data collected by the Department of

Justice on civil rights complaints arising from

enforcement of the Patriot Act;

And other remedies for potential civil rights problems arising from enforcement of the Patriot Act."

The methodology: "The Commission will host a briefing to address the above issues. Speakers may include but are not limited to the following." Speakers that would include the representatives from the appropriate components offices of the Department of Justice such as the Office of Legal Policy, Office of Inspector General, etcetera, including someone

responsible for the Hate Crimes Statistic Act. from the Federal 2 Speaker Bureau of 3 Investigation to describe their action and interaction with the American Arab and Islamic communities; and 4 5 Georgetown Law Professor Viet Dinh. The list is not over. Okay. And also a speaker from the Arab American Anti-Discrimination Committee. 8 9 A speaker from the Council on American-10 Islamic Relations. A resident of Lodi, California. 11 The briefing would last approximately 90 12 to two hours with four to six speakers allotted 10 to 13 15 minutes each, and the remaining time allotted for 14 15 questions. The projected costs would range from approximately \$3600 to \$4500. 16 Questioned that dollar figure. 17 Is that staff time or does that include -- is that out-of-18 pocket expense? 19 20 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That is out-ofpocket. 21 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. That is the --STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: And I would 23 clarify that there were some people on this list who 24 25 already invitations are extending. They may not be

able to come to the event. And that Mr. McCarthy has also been invited. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I need to go, so 5 I'd like to call the motion. VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I just have one question, Jennifer. Why have we listed in this motion, 8 why we have got this sentence "Speakers may include 9 but not limited to the following?" Is there some 10 point to this list? Because I would really prefer 11 that the staff director work out the list of speakers in response to the availability of people and have a 12 13 great deal of flexibility. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 14 15 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: So that I would prefer that that whole --16 "may 17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think include." 18 19 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I know it says may include. But it doesn't seem to me to serve much of a 20 point to have this list. 21 22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: As Jennifer knows, that's pretty standard lawyer-speak for whatever you 23 can think of. 24 25 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes, well I know.

1	I know. So I'm suggesting that lawyer-speak for
2	whatever you can think of is not a very useful
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm very sorry. I
4	really do need to hang up.
5	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Agree or disagree,
6	Jennifer, with what I just said?
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't think it
8	matters.
9	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: All right.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's a way to
11	phrase is the Staff Director's responsibility.
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Unless there
14	are additional comments, this is the last issue before
15	we adjourn. So if there are any additional comments
16	so we can allow Commissioner Braceras to scoot.
17	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: She's scooting
18	anyway.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I do have one
21	additional comment. I would like to just alert
22	Commissioner Braceras that I would like the Commission
23	to I have distributed a little bit of work product
24	here that I'll make a mention of before we adjourn.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Related to the
2	Roberts Supreme Court advocacy record.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
4	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, maybe it can
5	be mailed to Commissioner Braceras.
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It will be.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Move.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So second?
10	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Second.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Very good. All in
12	favor?
13	ALL: Aye.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
15	The motion passes unanimously.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Got to run
17	everybody. Thank you.
18	ALL: Thanks, Jennifer.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Thank you.
20	Okay. Commissioner Kirsanow?
21	IX. Compendium of Roberts's Advocacy Record
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: My assistant Chris
23	Jennings
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Has been very busy.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: at my request
	NEAL D. CDOSS

put together the impressive, I consider, a compendium of the briefs and other written material related to the civil rights record of the Supreme Court nominee.

It is, without editorial comment, it is simply a compendium of the facts of the case, the issues presented, the briefs he wrote, a summary of his advocacy position and the votes that were taken. And all of them pertain to matters within the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission, that is matters pertaining to race, sex, age, national origin, religion, so and so forth.

This is presented to my at my request and for my use. Having review it, I thought it was something that the other Commissioners would be interested in. I think it is the only place that I have seen anywhere in the public domain, at least, where a complete compendium of his advocacy record before the Supreme Court pertaining to civil rights has been put together.

In fact, if you take a look at the forward that Chris presented, if you take a look at the table of contents also, but if you take a look at the forward it summarizes fairly adequately, I think, what this is all about. Again, no editorial comment. He

didn't make any observations. This is simply raw data pertaining to Robert's Supreme Court advocacy. You can take it one way or anyway you wish, whether or not you think his advocacy positions were meritorious, whether or not you disagree with them; they're there for review.

And I would suggest that maybe this is something that the Commission consider placing on its Web site. And I'm not saying that's something that we talk about today, but I think it's something that satisfies our clearinghouse responsibilities under our charter.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And I think if you review it, you'll see that, again, no editorial comment. It's simply what it is. It's one plus one equals two.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And Chris included it appears transcripts.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. As you can see, this is nearly 500 pages long. He spent a lot of time on this collating the data. And it is, again, it's the raw information pertaining to his advocacy record.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Excellent. Excellent.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Good work, Chris. COMMISSIONER YAKI: How you did that and 2 3 do your bow tie? KIRSANOW: I'd like COMMISSIONER 5 introduce for the record just the forward for this, and then if the Commissioners wish, maybe at some 6 later point we could vote on whether this should be included on the web site. 8 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh no. I think that we 10 should, you know, go through the document over the next few weeks and then make a decision as to whether 11 there's a consensus to put this on the Web site. 12 What I have seen of this looks excellent. 13 It's one-stop shopping here instead of having to go 14 15 online and trying to get particular documents. just saves a lot of time. 16 17 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: We'll definitely have a vote on it. 18 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Once again, excellent work, Chris. 20 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: One last bit of 21 22 business. On the funding federal civil enforcement, there are two errors. 23 I know we've already voted on this report. But there are two 24 errors that really need to be corrected.

The first is the first sentence of the introduction, which reads "The year 2005 marks 60 years since Congress passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965." Sixty years has not passed since 1965. Clearly that has to read 40 years. That needs to be corrected before this goes to press.

And the description of Voting Rights Act enforcement is simply incorrect. It leaves out the preclearance function of the Voting Rights section, which is the main business, that is administrative preclearance. And that needs to be included in the description of what the Voting Rights section is responsible for.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other changes?

Well, it seems to me I don't think there will be any disagreement over the first issue.

The second, I suggest that we develop the language, circulate the language and if there are no violent objections to the proposed addition, that we just add it without a vote. If someone has a substantive concern about the language, we try to work out amongst ourselves. And if we're unable to, then we'll have to vote on it.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. That's right.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Good.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Meeting's adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:17 a.m.)